

REMARKS

The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 12, 2004 (Paper No. 7). Claims 1 to 33 are being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter. Claims 34 to 48 are being added of which Claims 34 and 46 to 48 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 3 to 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In addition, Claims 1 to 7, 11 to 19 and 23 to 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,680,749 (Anderson), Claims 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Anderson and U.S. Patent No. 5,752,053 (Takakura), and Claims 9, 10, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Anderson and U.S. Patent No. 6,657,702 (Chui). Without conceding the correctness of these rejections, Claims 1 to 33 are being cancelled.

New independent Claim 34 defines an image processing apparatus comprising a capturing unit, a first display control unit, a first selection indication unit, a second display control unit, an execution indication unit and a specifying unit. The capturing unit captures a reduction image from a storage medium storing storage images, the reduction images respectively corresponding to the storage images. The first display control unit causes a display device to display the reduction images captured by said capturing unit. The first selection indication unit selects and indicates those reduction images which are to be subjected to a specific image process, from the reduction images displayed on the display device. The second display control unit causes to sequentially display a larger size image for each of the reduction images indicated by said selection indication unit. The execution indication unit selects and indicates which of the storage

images are to be subjected to the specific image process, by selecting a corresponding larger size image sequentially displayed by said second display control unit. The specifying unit specifies as a group, as a target of the specific image process, the storage images corresponding to the larger size images indicated by said execution indication unit, upon completion of the display by said second display control unit.

Claim 34 has, among its many features, a first display control unit which causes captured reduction images to be displayed, a first selection indication unit selects and indicates those displayed reduction images which are to be subjected to a specific image process, a second display control unit which causes a sequential display of a larger size image for each of the indicated reduction images, an execution indication unit which selects and indicates which of the storage images are to be subjected to the specific image process, by selecting a corresponding larger size image sequentially displayed by said second display control unit, and a specifying unit which specifies as a group, as a target of the specific image process, the storage images corresponding to the larger size images indicated by said execution indication unit, upon completion of the display by said second display control unit.

The applied art, namely Anderson, Takakura and Chui, is not seen to show the above-identified features.

More particularly, Anderson is seen to describe displaying the results of different types of effects applied to an image 854 as thumbnail images 852, as shown in Figure 13, and discussed commencing at col. 12, line 49, of Anderson. This is not seen to show the above-identified features of Claim 34.

The portions of Takakura and Chui cited in the Office Action have been reviewed and are not seen to remedy the deficiencies noted above with respect to

Anderson.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 34 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 46 to 48 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

The other claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Carole A. Quinn
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 82244v1